

We also did it with the CHAMP bill that gives 6 million more children insurance and gives doctors the reimbursement they deserve, and seniors and people with disability the opportunity for health care.

We passed ethics reforms. We have done things to make this House better.

One thing the President and the people want us to do is work together. They don't want dilatory tactics by either side, and we have seen them, and the people on the other side know they have engaged in them. We need to have order in this House, respect for this House, and respect for the American people.

CHANGING OUTCOME OF VOTE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, last night, the Democratic majority leadership was in the process of attempting to violate the House of Representatives' rules by holding a vote open with the sole intent of changing the outcome of the vote.

As the vote changed from 214 "yeas" to 214 "nays" to 215 "yeas" to 213 "nays," the Speaker pro tempore brought down the gavel. Because he then realized the vote was in favor of the Republican motion, he didn't know what to do. The lighted scoreboard at either end of the Chamber showed 215 "yeas" to 213 "nays."

Then the Speaker and Parliamentarian allowed two more Democrats to change their vote. So the vote finally announced was 212 "yeas" and 216 "nays." The Parliamentarian said the vote was actually 214-214 when the vote closed. However, of course, he had no explanation for why the vote was officially called. He allowed the vote switching to continue until the vote became what it was announced. That is clearly because there is no proper explanation other than that, on the way to violating one rule, it became necessary to violate another.

It is also noteworthy that the vote was to further enable people who are breaking the law in America by being here illegally to not only break the law but receive money from those forced to pay taxes.

Then came the astounding news that the record was wiped clean of the computer evidence of what went wrong. When rules and laws don't matter, we change the destiny of history.

REMEMBER OUR MANNERS

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I have only been here 6 months as a freshman, but I have to tell you that I know America is watching, and I am wondering if our mothers are watching.

This is very rude behavior, the calling out, the cat-calling; and I think we understand that the American public sent all of us here to work together. Yes, there have been mistakes. I do recall when they were doing the Medicare part D how the vote was kept open by the majority for 3 hours while the Secretary of Health and Human Services walked up and down the aisle. That wasn't right, so all is forgiven.

The point here now is that the American public is watching us. They expect us to get this work done. They expect our behavior to be responsible and respectful. We wouldn't call out like this in a movie theater. We certainly shouldn't be calling out this way in the House of Representatives. I call on all of us to remember our manners.

ISSUE IS WHETHER ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS CAN GET BENEFITS

(Mr. MCHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, the issue before us is whether or not illegal immigrants can get government benefits, and the Democrat majority in this House has shown that they are willing to cheat in order to win a vote. Cheat in order to win a vote. And—

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like the gentleman's words taken down, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The Clerk will report the words.

□ 0945

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina may proceed.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, my point is that the actions of the Democrat majority on the House floor last night besmirches the character of this House, and it's because they support giving benefits to illegal aliens in this country, and it's about the issue of illegal immigration and whether or not illegals in this country can receive government benefits. They're willing to protect some of their freshmen vulnerable Democrats and make them toe the line.

But Mr. Speaker, when they lost the vote on the House floor, the Speaker came down and voted in this well in order to tie that vote, and when that wasn't good enough and when a vote switched and they lost, they lost that vote, they're willing to gavel it down in order to protect themselves from a tough vote demanding that illegals do not receive government benefits.

So, Mr. Speaker, was it a cover-up? Was it a sham? Absolutely. And some,

some believe the actions were cheating the facts.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 46 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1318

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PASTOR) at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 600 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 600

Resolved, That it shall be in order at any time through the legislative day of Friday, August 3, 2007, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules relating to the following measures:

(1) The bill (H.R. 3087) to require the President, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other senior military leaders, to develop and transmit to Congress a comprehensive strategy for the redeployment of United States Armed Forces in Iraq.

(2) A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain electronic surveillance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, additionally, I ask unanimous consent that our colleagues be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 600 authorizes the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules at any time through the legislative day of Friday, August 3, 2007, on the following measures:

First, H.R. 3087, a bill to require the President, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other military leaders, to develop and transmit to Congress a comprehensive strategy for redeployment of United States Armed Forces in Iraq; and, second, a bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to establish a procedure for authorizing certain electronic surveillance.

Mr. Speaker, it is particularly important at this juncture in my remarks that I make it very clear that we have heard a lot of talk from the other side of the aisle about the need to reform FISA. The Director of National Intelligence has identified a specific intelligence collection gap and spoken of "a backlog for things requiring a warrant," and I quote him. He claims that this is hindering our efforts to prevent terrorist attacks.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, takes its responsibilities to protect the Nation seriously. None of us on either side of the aisle want to leave our intelligence professionals short. The Intelligence Committee, the Judiciary Committee, the Homeland Security Committee, and the leadership have been working around the clock to come up with a solution that addresses this particular problem. However, again and again, the administration has overplayed their hand. Each time we get close to an agreement, they ask for more, and I might add the negotiations on this have been going on for over a year.

First they said Congress needed to clarify that the government shouldn't need a warrant to collect foreign communications. There was never ever any disagreement about that.

Then they said they wanted broader authority to conduct electronic surveillance of terrorist communications. We agreed to that.

Then they said they wanted immunity for the telecommunications carriers. We agreed to give them prospective immunity and would consider retrospective immunity when we get back.

But we insist on a couple of things. We want to preserve the role of the FISA Court as an independent check on the government to prevent them from infringing on the rights of Americans, and we insist that this legislation have a sunset. In this rushed environment before recess, we should not make permanent changes to FISA.

Last night, the congressional leadership was willing to make further changes for Director McConnell. He said with those changes he would support the bill because it would "significantly enhance America's security." And I am quoting him again. But after this agreement was reached, congressional Republicans insisted on a much broader, permanent bill, giving the Attorney General, this Attorney General, not the Court, the discretion to make decisions about surveillance involving Americans. Clearly, in my judgment, they are not negotiating in good faith.

If they reject this bill, the other side is saying, in the face of a resurgent al Qaeda, they don't want to plug the collection gap identified by the Director of National Intelligence immediately. They are rejecting "significantly enhancing America's security."

Now, if the other side insists on manufacturing obstructionist delays and rejecting agreements that will enhance our security, we can stay here all August and September and December until we get this done. The security of this Nation deserves no less.

This rule is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because under clause 1(a), rule XV, the Speaker may entertain motions to suspend the rules only on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday of each week. In order for suspensions to be considered on other days, as my colleagues well know, the Rules Committee must authorize consideration of these motions.

This is not an unusual procedure, as some on the other side may suggest. In fact, in the 109th Congress, alone, my friends on the other side of the aisle reported at least six rules that provided for additional suspension days.

This rule limits the suspension of rules to only these two bills and will help us move important legislation before we leave for the August recess. Time is, indeed, of the essence. Not because many in this body wish to go home this weekend but, rather, because of the gravity of these situations both here at home and abroad.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in support of this rule and the underlying piece of legislation.

I do wish to put my colleagues on notice that, following the conclusion of debate on this rule, I intend to offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will permit the House to consider emergency legislation today appropriating \$250 million to begin the reconstruction of the I-35 bridge, which collapsed this week in Minnesota. We have properly given our condolences and continue those to those who have lost loved ones and those who are awaiting word regarding those who are still missing and those who have been injured. All of us grieve with all of them.

Without this amendment and this rule, this legislation will not be permitted to proceed; and these emergency funds would be delayed. Realize a vote against this rule and my amendment to the rule will be a vote against providing this emergency assistance to the people of Minnesota, specifically Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman from Florida yielding me time, and I do know that we are here today, among other things, to seek immediate resolution from the United States Congress to help the wonderful people of Minnesota in their time of grief by authorizing money that will be spent to immediately rebuild the bridge that collapsed over the Mississippi.

All Members of this body watched the horror the other night as we saw not only the collapse but also the heroism of men and women, first responders and others, as they joined in to help the people of Minneapolis-St. Paul as they struggled with this.

I would note that the committee action, regular order, has taken place to make sure that this bill would be before not only the Democrat majority but also we as Republicans participated in each of these activities.

□ 1330

The gentleman stood up and talked about how great and wonderful and what normal and regular things happen around here, but these are not normal times.

Once again today, here we are on the floor of the House of Representatives almost as a new law, I would say, Mr. Speaker, being asked to debate a rule on the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, and we don't even have a copy of the bill. So I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, can we please see a copy of the bill?

I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. This matter is under suspension. My friend on the Rules Committee and I were there when it passed out of the Rules Committee on suspension, and that requirement is met.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I don't understand this. This new Democrat majority that comes to town, talks about open and honesty, ethics above reproach, all the things that they would do differently than what the Republicans have done, and they have not lived up to that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I would yield to the gentleman if he will answer the question: Where is the copy of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that we're doing the rule on today that we're expected to vote on today?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Thank you for yielding. It is in the hopper. The minority members of the Intelligence Committee have the measure.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, I would yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding, and I see we're joined here by a very distinguished member of the House Committee on Intelligence. I think we have been, for literally months, trying to make in order the legislation that has been introduced by our friend from Albuquerque (Mrs. WILSON), and we believe that that, in fact, is the answer to this problem.

The President of the United States, in the news conference that he held with Mike McConnell about an hour ago, made it crystal clear that he is going to ask the Director one question: If he gets legislation that emerges from this body, will it, in fact, enhance our ability to make sure that foreigners on

foreign soil who are trying kill us, if the legislation provides them with the tools to intercept those conversations and prevent them from having the ability to attack the United States of America?

Now, my friend from Dallas has just very correctly said, can we see the legislation that we're expected to vote upon today if this suspension rule is made in order that will do exactly what the President has said is necessary to ensure the safety and the security of the American people?

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from California for his words.

Mr. Speaker, this Democrat majority has simply not lived up to the words that it spoke when it became the new majority. And it was a campaign promise that is reiterated on a regular basis all through this Chamber and all the committees. Most disappointing among these is the forgotten promise that Democrats promised to be the most open, honest and ethical Congress in history.

And I will now quote Speaker PELOSI from page 24 of *A New Direction for America*, and I quote, "Bills should generally come to the floor under a procedure that allows open, full and fair debate consisting of a full amendment process that grants the minority the right to offer its alternatives, including a substitute."

I further quote the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, on November 12, 2006, just a week after election. She said, "My fellow Democrats and I have long felt that the Rules Committee was failing its major obligations. We publicly argued that it was being used to shut down the legislative process for partisan purposes. But now that the Democrats will control the committee we will have a chance to change all that."

Mr. Speaker, they have not changed it. They've made it worse.

We do understand right now, as we speak, we have a copy of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act that evidently has only now been given to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. At this time, I am very pleased to yield to my colleague, with whom I've served 7 years on the Select Committee on Intelligence. She was the ranking member and is now the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Before yielding to Ms. HARMAN, who has gone down this road for well over a year to get us to this point, I would like to say to my friend from Texas that perhaps it would be helpful if he would ask the minority members of the Intelligence Committee about the bill.

Secondly, the measure that we are dealing with is a rule providing for suspension, not consideration.

That said, I yield 3 minutes to my friend from California (Ms. HARMAN).

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and commend him for his long service, both on the Intelligence and Rules Committees.

I am now the Chair of an Intelligence Subcommittee of Homeland Security. As no one in this Chamber would miss, security is my passion, and I think it is our primary obligation as Members of Congress.

I was sitting here listening to the discussion about where is the bill and why aren't we acting on FISA? It seems a little disingenuous, given the fact that the current ranking member on the Intelligence Committee and former chairman, has an article in *USA Today* in which he says that this move to get the administration to put its surveillance program under FISA "gives legal protections to foreign enemies who would do us harm."

Excuse me? FISA, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act passed by a large bipartisan majority in 1978. FISA was passed to assure that Americans, not foreigners, would have their constitutional rights protected when the U.S. engages, as it must, in foreign intelligence surveillance.

I don't think there is anyone here, not that I know of, who is against foreign intelligence surveillance. There is no one in this body. I haven't heard one person say that we think that when the U.S. engages in foreign intelligence surveillance, in foreign countries involving communications between foreigners in different foreign countries, that FISA applies. But FISA can and must apply when Americans' constitutional rights are at issue, and that is the issue we will debate a little bit later.

I want to say that it surprises me again that all of a sudden no one knows what we might be talking about. There have been intense negotiations, I have been a part of some of them, for months over what we might do to make FISA work better. In the 109th Congress, all nine Democrats on the Intelligence Committee authored legislation to help FISA work better; and in this Congress I'm aware of both closed and open hearings by the Intelligence Committee to carefully consider these issues.

So it seems to me quite surprising and disingenuous to hear that, for example, the ranking member of the Intelligence Committee doesn't even feel that FISA protects Americans; he thinks that it coddles foreigners.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman because I have some confusion over here, and you may be able to help me.

As I look at this, I think this is the bill that was rejected by the Director of National Intelligence 36 hours ago as insufficient. And it is not the bill that, as I understand it, was going to be accepted by the Senate this morning that the DNI proposed.

Is the House offering a different bill than has been accepted by the Senate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional minute to respond.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Reclaiming my time, I don't have a copy of the latest draft. It may be one I've seen, but I'm not absolutely positive. My understanding is that negotiations have been going on for quite a long time and that the requirements of the DNI have been met.

What is happening, and I think it's a real tragedy for the American people, is that the goalposts keep moving. I just wonder whether the other side wants this to be a wedge issue or wants to solve the problem.

As one Member here who has worked on this for years, I want to solve the problem; and we will attempt to do that under the suspension rules later today.

Mr. SESSIONS. You know, Mr. Speaker, we talk about this genuine desire to solve the problem, but the fact of the matter is we're about as close as midnight and noon in our thoughts and beliefs as parties for doing that.

I hearken back to just a few days ago in the Rules Committee, where some of the questions from my good friends on the Democrat side are: Well, what about the constitutional rights of some of these people who live in other countries who are known terrorists, what about their constitutional rights? And we need to take those into account.

Mr. Speaker, it's amazing how we're sitting here debating something that's in the best interests of this country, and some people are more concerned about the terrorists' rights than they are about protecting this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I have the highest regard for my California colleague (Ms. HARMAN). She knows that very well. We share representing Los Angeles County here. And I know that she has worked very hard on intelligence issues.

But I will say that I am very troubled with the exchange that I just saw take place between my friend from Albuquerque here, who has worked on this. She talked about the fact that we have legislation that was just rejected 36 hours ago by the Director of National Intelligence, Mr. McConnell. And my friend from California has just said something to the effect that she's not sure exactly what bill it is that we're looking at. I'm not an expert on this myself.

I would be happy to yield to my friend if she wants to respond at all on this.

Ms. HARMAN. Well, what I meant was that I'm aware that there were negotiations going on with the DNI last

evening. So drafts have been shared back and forth. All I said was that I came over to the floor to support the rule to permit this issue to be addressed under suspension, and I don't have in my hand what may be the latest version.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, I know my colleague would certainly share this concern to support the rule, but we like the idea of seeing what it is that we're about to vote upon before we do that. I know that may be an unusual request under this majority, but I think that is definitely fair. And I will say that I think that it's right and correct that Members have a chance to see what it is that they're voting upon, rather than having something thrown upon them.

And we have Mrs. WILSON, who has legislation that we've offered probably a dozen times on our quest to defeat the previous question on rules so that we could at least allow consideration of this. And so that has led us, I believe, to this point.

But I think it is just absolute lunacy to believe that we are, at this moment, in a position to go ahead and vote upon something that we don't know what it consists of. And I know my friend would agree with that, that we really shouldn't have a pattern like that.

Ms. HARMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I would be happy to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield 30 seconds to Ms. HARMAN.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, just to respond to that, I'm not interested in lunacy, and I know that Mr. DREIER is not, and I'm sure that Ms. WILSON and Mr. HOEKSTRA are not either.

There is a way to solve this problem correctly. I believe that the draft, which I'm certain will be circulated to everybody imminently, I believe that you will see that it is a very careful and balanced effort to address this problem, and it has been shared.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think I've got it in my hands right now.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. The gentleman says he has a copy of the bill in his hand. I would remind the distinguished ranking member of the Rules Committee, who is my good friend, that this rule is to make in order a suspension day.

Mr. DREIER. I understand that.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I'm glad you do understand it.

I would ask the gentleman from Texas to ask his Republican colleagues on the Intelligence Committee why they didn't share the bill with the Rules Committee Republicans. We cannot control what you do or do not do.

And under the circumstances, Ms. HARMAN just made it very clear to you that the goalposts keep moving. You try to act as if you don't know that for a year and a half that this has been

going on here in this intelligence community, working with this administration, trying to take care of this matter.

Now understand this. First, you said on that side that Congress needed to clarify that the government shouldn't need a warrant to collect foreign-to-foreign communications. There was never any disagreement about that, and stop saying it to the American public.

Then they said they wanted broader authority to conduct electronic surveillance of terrorist communications. We agreed to that.

Then they said they wanted immunity for the telecommunications carriers. We agreed to give them prospective immunity and consider retrospective immunity when we get back.

Last night, not yesterday, not midnight to noon, and some people have gotten caught in the dark, last night, the congressional leadership was willing to make further changes for Director McConnell. He said that with those changes he would support the bill because it would, in his word, "significantly" enhance America's security.

But after this agreement was reached, congressional Republicans insisted on a much broader bill giving the Attorney General, not the Court, the discretion to make decisions about surveillance involving Americans. Clearly, in my judgment, as I said previously, you're not negotiating in good faith.

I remind you once again that this rule is to make in order a suspension day. You will have all the time you need to do all the reading you need to do.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 21½ minutes. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard it straight out: You don't need to see the bill. You will see it whenever we want to give it to you. You don't need it. All we are doing down here is playing tiddlywinks with national security.

Mr. Speaker, I disagree with that. We disagree with that. I think this is an unfair way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the privilege to serve on the Intelligence Com-

mittee now, but in the 1980s I did. Then, following that, in the 1990s when I served in California as the attorney general, I recall getting security briefings from the intelligence community from Washington, DC.

It was during the Clinton administration that Admiral McConnell was the head of the NSA. I do not recall any partisan or bipartisan dispute about his qualifications, his professionalism or his judgment. He is the man that the President has brought out of retirement to be the Director of National Intelligence. He is the one that has presented to us in open and in closed testimony why we need this.

I think it is fair for us to ask, if we are getting a draft that he has rejected, why it is the draft that is going to be presented to us under the suspension calendar. Unless we have changed the rules of the House in the 16 years I was gone, the whole concept of a suspension bill is that you suspend all the rules for noncontroversial bills. Noncontroversial bills. If the head of our intelligence services believes that this is so controversial we ought to reject this, then why is it being brought up under this kind of a suspension?

Now, I have tried to work and have worked with the gentlewoman from California on many occasions getting bipartisan legislation through this floor. But this is the single most important bill that I have seen brought up in the 3 years that I have been back, and maybe in the 10 years I was here before.

This goes to the question of whether we take our blinders off with respect to intelligence, with respect to what kind of chatter that is going on around the world. And, yes, they say we all agree that foreign-to-foreign communications ought to be not under the purview of the Court, because we understand that has never been protected under the Constitution. We have been informed that the draft that we are talking about would not allow us to do that in the way it is necessary to protect this Nation.

That is why it is so important; not that it is partisan, not that somebody came here under one rule or another, but because the head of intelligence for the United States has said we can't accept this draft. If he says that, we ought to listen to him. We ought to try and get something that will work.

So let's forget about this nonsense of partisanship. Let's not get up here, shake something out here in the hand and say, well, you have had it long enough. I don't know how long it took the Constitution to be written from beginning to end. It wasn't how long it took. It is the words they put there. It is what they actually produced. That is what we are going to be judged by; not by how many hours we were here, but whether we got it right.

The Director of National Intelligence has told us we have gotten it wrong now. All our people back home are in jeopardy. We are in jeopardy because it